

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested since it places the application in condition for allowance and no new issues are raised by the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Hong et al. (Korean Publication No. 10-2002-0017795). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of now cancelled claim 2. As amended, claim 1 recites, in part, a method for forming a micro pattern that includes providing a semiconductor substrate in which a lower film is formed using TiN, SiON, Si₃N₄, organic anti-reflection coating of amorphous carbon series or an inorganic anti-reflection coating. In contrast, the Office Action asserts that Hong discloses forming an interlayer dielectric 31 on a semiconductor substrate 30 and asserts that the dielectric 31 is equivalent to the lower film recited in claim 1. The Office Action further asserts that page 7 of Hong discloses that the dielectric 31 is formed using TiN, SiON, Si₃N₄, organic anti-reflection coating of amorphous carbon series or an inorganic anti-reflection coating. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hong does not disclose, teach or suggest using TiN, SiON, Si₃N₄, organic anti-reflection coating of amorphous carbon series or an inorganic anti-reflection coating to form the dielectric layer 31. In fact, Hong merely discloses that layer 31 is an interlayer dielectric and is silent with respect to any other feature of the layer. Accordingly, Hong fails to teach, or even suggest, a method for forming a micro pattern that includes providing a semiconductor substrate in which a lower film is formed using TiN, SiON, Si₃N₄, organic anti-reflection coating of amorphous carbon series or an inorganic anti-reflection coating, as recited in amended claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, and 6-10 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hong. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 5 and 11 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of its dependence upon claim 1 and because, as discussed above, Hong does not teach or suggest at least the features discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: July 1, 2005